(9)

Previous references.

P.W. Dis 89 of 0

B.

Gb 1-4

File No. 94-1, of 1903 04.

& 102 1904

(III - Police.)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 4.

PART B FOR August 1904.

SUBJECT.

Bill of fees on behalf of Mr Ramanna Advocate Mysore, for defending certain Police officers of the Mysore City

File No. 94 of 1903-04.

Bill of Fees on behalf of Mr. Ramanna, Advocate, Mysore, for defending certain Police Officers of the Mysore City.

A 1621

	1	From the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, No. 6315—383, dated 16th April 1904. Requests sanction to a bill for Rs. 125 on behalf of Advocate Mr. Ramanna who defended certain Police officers of the Mysore City, in a case of certain charges brought against them by one Mallappa. [With enclosures, 4 files.]
	2	To the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, No. 2471-J., dated 19th May 1904. Observes that no fees should have been charged for appearance on the day the judgment was delivered and no act was done by the Advocate, and returns the bill for retransmission with the countersignature of the presiding Magistrate as required by para 6 of Rule 7 of the Rules for the employment and remuneration of Legal Practitioners.
G. R. S. 58.	3	From the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, No. 757—76, dated 5th August 1904. Returns the bill duly countersigned by the presiding Magistrate, and states that the Advocate is willing to forego his fees for the day the judgment was pronounced.

1. No. 1833-4—J. 1661, dated 19th Mar. 1902.
2. No. 1932-35—J. 137 of 02-03, dated 16th March 1904.

SECTION Police

FILE NO. 94-03

G.R.S. 11] 1903-04.

SERIAL NO.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Police.)

NOTES.

File No. 94 of 03-04

FILE HEADING.

Bill of fees on behalf of Mr Ramanna, Advocate Iyana, for defending certain Police Officers of the Mysore City.

From

The Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

No. 6315, Dated 16-4-04. Received 21-4-04.

Diary No. 1621. | Enclos. 4 Pls. Spare Copies. | Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Requests sanction to a bill for Rs 125/- presented Advocate for having defended the Mysore Police Officers concerned, in a charge of hurt to extort confession.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1. Submitted with a draft order sanctioning the bill and pointing out the delay. [The above reference is a reply to this office docket d/29-12-03]

Dy S. R. 16-5-04.

2. Is there not a standing order

NOTES—First sheet.

MGCPB—5,000—15-5-04

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 94 of 1903-04

Serial No.

That the maximum fee payable in any one case is ordinarily only Rs 100? Let me see it. (1) Detach bill and pin to draft

Sd/ K. S. C.
17.5.04

Submitted

(1) There was such an order before, but it is omitted in the revised rules issued with Government Proceedings No 1932-53 dt./ J-137/02-03 16th March 1904. (2) Attended to.

Sd/ S. R.
17-5-04

Draw attention to clause (6) of Rules and ask that the bill be countersigned by the Magistrate

Sd/ K. S. C.
17.5.04.

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

MGCPB—10,000—19-5-04

Draft submitted as ordered

The Magistrate has issued a certificate showing the dates on which the Advocate appeared to conduct the case in his Court (Vide sheet attached to the bill)

SM 15/5/04. ~~The~~ The fee charged for appearance on 24th June 1902, when judgment was delivered is inadmissible.

More except as allowed

M 15/5/04

Draft issued, pointing out the above

Sl. No. 2. No. 2471 dated the 19th May from the I.G. of Police.

Sl. No. 3. Letter No. 757-16 dated the 5th April 1904 from the I.G. of Police in resubmitting the bill referred to countersigned by the presiding

~~Mr Ramanna~~ With reference to the payment of fees on the day on which the judgment was delivered, Mr Ramanna

Say

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 94 of 1903-04

Serial No.

that he was not engaged by the ~~for~~ days, that the amount settled for the whole case, irrespective of the no of days, was Rs 125, but that if the Govt is not prepared to pay him for the day of judgment, he is willing to forego the fee for that day.

Subt with a draft order, reducing the amount of the bill to Rs 110.

SN 13/8/04 RW 13.8.04 The bill is allowed in accordance with rules. A letter drafted may be passed -

Lee's

1 Sept 04

~~Draft order~~ Draft passed

15. 8 - 1904

Who settled this? Not apparent - W

Record in P5 1 A 8-04

Note—Contn. sheet.

MGCPB—10,000—19-5-04

1903-04.

2-16.

21 APR. 1904

From

The Inspector General of P

in Mysore.

SECT Police

FILE No. 34-03.

To

The Secretary to the Govt: of

H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore

Gen: and Rev: Department

Dated 16th.

Despatched 20 April 1904.

Received

General No. 6315

No. 383

Enclosure No. 4 Police

Requesting sanction to the payment of the bill for Rs 125/- submitted by Mr. Ramanna, Advocate, for having defended the Police Officers of the Mysore City in a charge of hurt to extort confession brought against them by one Mallapp

1-a

File No 94 of 03-04
Sl: No 1

J1621

Office of the
Inspector General of Police in Mysore
Dated, Bangalore, 16th. April 1904.

NO: 603/5
383 (4 file,)

20

From

F.E.C.Carr Esquire,
Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

To

L.Anantasami Rao Esquire,
Offg. Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore in the General and Revenue
Departments.

Sir,

Your docket No. J. 973 of the 29th. December 1902 requesting to be informed whether in the departmental enquiry the conduct of the Police Officers of the Mysore City, who were charged by one Mallappa, with having --- caused hurt to him to extort confession in a theft case, has been sufficiently blameless to render it unnecessary to call upon them to recoup the whole or any portion of the expense of their defence.

(2) I have the honor to forward herewith a detailed Memo. from the Superintendent of Police received with the Deputy Commissioner's endorsement No. 455 dated the 23rd. January 1904, in which he states that in his opinion the Police Officers concerned were unnecessarily subjected to considerable anxiety and expense in defending themselves against the charges brought by Mallappa against them, which charges Mallappa was unable to substantiate in a competent Court.

(3) It is evident from the Superintendent's report that there were very strong grounds for suspecting Mallappa of the theft of jewels, and that there was absolutely no evidence worth considering to prove that during the

investigation

investigation Mallappa was subjected by the Police to any --- illegal force for the extortion of evidence.

(4) This being the case, I consider that it is only fair that Government should come forward to pay the expenses ofthe ---- Police Officers who have been unnecessarily harassed in this case.

(5) I request, therefore, that you will be so good as to move the Government to accord their sanction to the payment of the bill submitted by Advocate Mr. Ramanna for Rs 125/-. The Police records in the case of theft against Mallappa and a copy of Judgment in the case of hurt to extort confession (No. 73 of 1901-02) against the Police Officers are herewith forwarded . The original enclosures received with your docket above quoted are also herewith returned.

I have the honor to be ,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant ,

Inspector General of Police.

Serial No 2

SECTION Police
FILE NO. 94-03 To
SERIAL NO. 2

2

The I. G. of Police in Mysore.

No. 2421/J
Date: 19th May 1904

In returning herewith the bill for Rs 125 submitted by Mr. A. Ramanna, Advocate, for having defended certain Police officers of the Mysore City, received with his letter No. 1315/383 dated 20th April 1904 I beg the honour to invite his attention to clause (6) of Rule 7 of the Rules for the employment & remuneration of Legal Practitioners issued with Govt Pro: No. 1932-55 / J. 137-02-03 dated 16th March 1904 and to request that

4

the ~~bill~~ Countersignature of the

Magistrate in the case may

be obtained to the bill and

the same retransmitted to this

office at a very early date -

Ro See Mendi have been charged for appearance on
~~the 24 inst~~ 1902, when instalment was delivered
~~was~~ not yet on the Warrant but Procedo remained
to be done

By Order

For Colly Secretary

IAC
18/5/04.

III / Dec / 1898

(Police)

1353

1904-05.

Police From,

The Inspector General of Police

in Mysore

34-0-3

3

To,

The Secretary to the Govt: of

H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore

in the Genl: & Reve: Departments.

Dated.

Despatched. 9 August

Received.

General No:

No: 1357/76

Enclosure No:

one file

Resubmitting for sanction a bill on behalf of Mr: Ramanna, Advocate

Dept Secretary to the Govt for the Home Department

5 F353 Ill. No 3

No 757/76 one file

Office of the
Inspector General of Police in Mysore.
Dated Bangalore, 5th August 1904.

9

From,

F. E. C. Carr Esquire,
Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To,

B. K. Venkatavardaiengar Esquire,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
in the General and Revenue Departme

Sir,

Reference:-

Your docket No: 2471/J of the 19th May 1904 regarding the bill on behalf of Advocate Mr: Ramanna;

--------coOoo--------

I have the honor to return herewith the bill referred to duly countersigned by the presiding Magistrate.

As regards para 2 of the docket under reference, I beg to submit herewith in original Mr: Ramanna'a letter stating that the amount settled for the whole case was Rs: 125/- and that if the Government is not prepared to pay him for the day on which judgment was pronounced, he is willing to forego his fee for that day.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Inspector General of Police.

9

R.L.

G.R.S. 28]

SEC. ... 92 Police
FILE No. 94-03
SER. ... 4

File No. 94 of 1903-04
Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to ———

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
(Police)

, *the* 15/8/04 Hag P 190

Date of issue 17/8/04

Signed by Mr K. B. Chandra Sekhara Aiyar

READ.—

Letter No. 2650/196 dated the 16th December 1902, from the Inspector-General of Police in Mysore submitting for sanction a bill for Rs 125 being the fees claimed by Mr A. Ramanna, Advocate for having defended certain Police officers of the Mysore City who were accused of having caused

over

ORDER THEREON.—No.

SUBJECT

MGCPB—5,000—24-6-04

hurt to one Mallick for the pur-
-pose of extorting a confession from
him in a theft case.

2. Letter No. 6315/383 dated the 16th April [Flag]
1902, from the same Officer, re-
-porting in reply to Govt docket No.
973 dated the 29th December 1902
that in his opinion the Police officers
concerned were unnecessarily sub-
-jected to considerable anxiety and
expense in defending themselves against
the charges, which were not substantiated
and that there is absolutely no evidence
worth considering to prove that during
the investigation the complainant was
subjected to any illegal force for
the extortion of evidence

3. Letter No. 757/76 dated the [Papers under disposal]
5th August 1904, from the same Officer
returning the bill duly countersigned

by the presiding ~~Judge~~ Magistrate in the Case as required by the rules

Order thereon. No. 448-44
Police(Gen 603-4)-4.

The bill for Rs 112 5 Submitted by the Advocate includes ~~Rs 16~~ fee for the day on which judgment was delivered in the Case. As there was no necessity for the appearance of the Advocate on that day, the fee for that day is disallowed and the bill is Sanctioned for Rs ~~110~~ 110 and forwarded to the Comptroller for audit. The charge will be met out of the provision made in the current years budget under "Law & Justice" ' Fees to

Sri Ramanna, according to usual calculation, should have charged Rs 128. Deducting Rs 16, the fee for one day disallowed by Govt, the Amount comes to Rs 110.

9

Pleaders in criminal cases",

~~under the Act~~ "Law and

~~Justice~~".

2. Government regret

to observe that there has been

very great delay in the

submission of a reply to the

enquiry made in December 1962. Flag V

15/8/15-7

13/8/15-7

Secretary

S.N
13/8/74

13.8.74

The D.G. of Police in Nigeria,

returning the original enclosures

with compliments and with the

Copd: V.R.K. 6-8-74

Encrd: N.R. 6.8.74